Social Progress

A United Approach to Social Ills . . . . . VIRGIL E. LOWDER
Changing Community—Changing Church. . WILLIAM N. LOVELL

MARCH 1949

Vol. XXXIX

Social Progress

No. 7

DIVISION OF SOCIAL EDUCATION AND ACTION

PAUL NEWTON POLING, Secretary and Editor; MARGARET E. KUHN, Assistant Editor; CLIFFORD EARLE, Associate Secretary; FERN M. COLBORN, Assistant Secretary; and WILLIAM H. MCCONAGHY, Director, and JESSE BELMONT BARBER, Associate Director of the Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations.

CONTENTS : MARCH, 1949

Articles PAGE

A United Approach to Social Ills, *by Virgil E. Lowder* 1

Changing Community—Changing Church, *by William N. Lovell* 4

They Said It Couldn't Be Done, *by Mark W. Abernethy* 9

Pros and Cons of the North Atlantic Pact, *by Vera Micheles Dean* 14

Background of the North Atlantic Pact, *by Blair Bolles* 22

I Favor Federal Aid to Education, *by Charles J. Turck* 30

Editorial Comment

An Appeal to Faith 24

Sanctuary 34

Christian Action 36

About Books 47

Articles represent the opinions of the authors, and not the official policy of the Division of Social Education and Action or the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Published monthly, except July and August, by the Division of Social Education and Action of the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at 1009 Sloan Street, Crawfordsville, Indiana. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial and Executive office, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Subscriptions, $1.00 a year; three years for $2.50. Single copy, 15 cents. Group rates on request.

Copyright 1949 by the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

A UNITED APPROACH TO SOCIAL ILLS

By VIRGIL E. LOWDER, *Executive Secretary, Department of Social Service, Church Federation of Greater Chicago.*

RECENTLY a well-meaning minister was found to be placing unwanted and neglected children in his parish with families other than their own, in violation of a state law. He had not taken the trouble to find out what the legal requirements were in such matters. Only prompt action saved him from the embarrassment of prosecution by state authorities.

Six ministers of a particular denomination in a Midwestern city accidentally found that each of them had given money to the same individual, who had come to each church with a heartbreaking story of the illness of his wife and the suffering of his children. A simple telephone call would have disclosed the fact that the man's story was untrue, and that he was a chronic beggar who preyed on churches, and did not need the assistance he asked.

A Christmas Clearinghouse was organized in another city for the purpose of making certain that all families in need received aid at Christmas time and of avoiding duplication of baskets and gifts to certain families, registered with several churches and agencies. The eight hundred ministers in the city were notified of this clearinghouse and were asked to give it their support, but only five took the trouble to co-operate in this worthy enterprise by calling and making known the families their churches planned to aid.

In an Illinois town a meeting of ministers and social workers was called by state-wide church and welfare agencies, who were conducting a series of such meetings throughout the state. A prominent minister and the director of the agency handling public assistance in the community attended. Each confessed that although they had lived and worked in the same community for twelve years and had even sought to help the same family in a few instances, they had never met. Nor had they co-operated in attempting to solve the problems of the families known to each. The social worker had valuable knowledge of underlying problems in some of the family situations, which would have been helpful to the minister. The minister had a close relationship and an "in" with some of the families, which could have enabled him to motivate action leading to the solution

of some of their problems. But neither took advantage of the resources represented in the other.

For instance, there was the B—— family. B was a laborer, earning such a small salary that his family were barely able to get along. Mrs. B was not well. There were four children: Nancy, age 9; Tommie, 7; Beulah, 6; and Selma, 6 months. Beulah was a handicapped child. She needed to go away for treatment, but the social worker could not bring Mr. and Mrs. B to agree. The minister could probably have secured their acceptance, but he did not know what the social worker was trying to do, and Mrs. B did not tell her pastor that they were receiving help from the social agency because she felt ashamed of that fact.

These are not isolated instances. Almost every community has among its ministers a few who co-operate closely with social agencies, and who attempt to bring to the aid of their parishioners all the resources available for the solution of their problems. But in the same localities other ministers go about their work seemingly oblivious to the invaluable resources represented in community welfare agencies. In even a small church an alert minister who has established close and helpful relationships with the families in his parish finds himself faced with a wide variety of individual and family problems. Here is a family that find they can no longer care for an aged father who is chronically ill. A couple married twelve years, and with two children, are having serious marital difficulty and are threatened with divorce. A widow with three small children struggles to make ends meet on her small allowance, unaware that she is eligible for assistance under the Aid to Dependent Children program. A woman is in need of psychiatric service and does not know where to turn. These and a thousand other problems confront the observant pastor. Practically every community has agencies designed to offer services to meet at least some of these needs. Yet many ministers have not learned to use the resources at hand.

Why this tragic failure on the part of so many ministers to co-operate with community agencies? The problem goes back in part to the minister's training. The curriculum of many of our theological seminaries does not include any really adequate training that would enable the theological student to gain an understanding of the way in which the modern community is organized for welfare. He is not likely there to learn of the service available through the family agency and other specialized agencies, the facts regarding the various public-assistance programs, the function of the community referral service, and the social-service exchange. He often is not given the training he needs to see clearly his function as a minister-

counselor in relation to that of the social worker and the psychiatrist in the treatment of human ills. He may develop a mistrust of the social worker and an aversion to social work. He cannot understand why the social worker will not give him all the facts she has regarding a particular family, overlooking the confidential nature of her service and the policy of her agency, which does not permit disclosure of case records. He cannot understand why the intake policy of an agency will not permit it to accept a family in whom he is deeply concerned.

In seeking to remedy this deficiency for ministers coming to Chicago, the Department of Social Service of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has, for a number of years, carried on a program designed to increase understanding and co-operation between ministers and social workers. Tours are held several times each year for new ministers in the city. These tours give an opportunity for the pastor to become acquainted with his larger parish—the city—and to know from firsthand experience something of its problems. They include visits to the various social agencies, where the ministers learn of services available and how they may be utilized.

The second step is the arrangement of meetings of ministers and social workers in local communities, in which the ministers tell of individual and family problems confronting them in their parishes, and the ministers and social workers discuss together the possible ways of dealing with these problems. Out of these conferences in some instances continuing co-operation has grown between a minister and a social worker, often greatly to the benefit of the parishioner or client in whose interest they work as a team. Other groups are set up in which social workers meet with outstanding religious leaders to discuss the resources in religion for individual, family, and community life, and the role of the church in the community.

There is evidence that ministers and social workers are increasingly aware of the gulf existing between them, and that many in both groups are eager to bridge that gap.

The true minister is interested in the total welfare of each member of his parish. He remembers that Christ both taught and healed, and he seeks to do the same. Wise is he if he learns to use as many as possible of his community's resources, thus giving greater help to his members and at the same time saving himself and his energies for the more specialized religious ministry which is his unique responsibility. Thus he not only helps those for whom he is responsible to find solutions to their many serious problems, but also saves himself for the supremely important task to which he has been called and for which he is prepared.

CHANGING COMMUNITY— CHANGING CHURCH

By WILLIAM N. LOVELL, *minister, South Congregational Church, Chicago, Illinois.*

THE story of South Congregational Church in Chicago is the story of a normal church attempting to adjust itself to the radical changes of its community. The church did not start out with a self-conscious interracial basis; but it has become interracial in its membership in natural adjustment to the character of its neighborhood.

In the last five years South Church has changed, first, from an all-white congregation to one with a 20 per cent minority of Japanese-Americans, then to one with almost equal minorities of Negroes and Japanese-Americans. It now finds itself with a very few of the latter and an increasingly larger proportion of Negroes. But it has remained South Church throughout the transition.

At the turn of the century South Church was a thriving and fashionable center on the growing edge of the city in a stable, high-class residential area; but the neighborhood changed, and early in 1943 the struggling remnant of a long and fine tradition had to make a decision. The community of "Oakland" had become a rooming-house area with the old families leaving and social disorganization setting in. The congregation of seventy or eighty, which had been without a full-time pastor for a year, looked mighty lonely in a sanctuary that could seat 450. A stronger and wealthier congregation might have followed the accepted pattern and moved to the suburbs where the pastures were greener. Another alternative might have been to sell the church. Instead, the church membership and the Chicago Congregational Union which heavily supported the church agreed to put all effort into maintaining and expanding the work of the church in the community. Consequently Rev. Howard E. Spragg was called in the middle of 1943 to become the minister, and I joined him as associate minister in the fall.

A Normal Active Church

We came to South Church with the clear understanding that we would minister to its all-white constituency, even though the back door of the church opened to the solid Negro population of Chicago's southside. We accepted the white area as our bailiwick.

Evidences were clear, however, that Negroes would eventually cross the line eastward and would gradually move southward along the lake and into "our" locality. In preaching and conversation we made plain that to be a Christian church we would be open to all who wished to worship. But in the first few years nothing was done to recruit Negroes into the church. Our ministry was in building up the church in all the ordinary phases of its life; and numerically, financially, and in the measure of activity the church was strengthened so that it could meet the changes as they came.

The first change was unexpected. Thousands of Japanese-Americans came to Chicago in 1944 and many settled in Oakland. It was assumed that they would be welcomed into the church. This happened. A large group became active in the church and in the Sunday church school after we called on them to assure them of a welcome. Undoubtedly the presence of nisei helped to ease the way for one or two Negroes to attend.

It required persistence to get the first few Negroes to come faithfully. But they finally realized that the church and its ministry meant business even though a good deal of resistance existed in the minds of some members. "As soon as you let one in, the church will go"; "They have their own churches, why don't they go to them?" were a few of the comments that went the rounds. Some church members, however, were just as clear in their Christian conviction that the church must welcome everyone no matter what the color or race might be. It helped also that the first Negroes were well-educated persons; and to have a Negro girl singing in the choir was a visible sign of welcome.

Integration Becomes Accepted

The key question, however, had not yet been raised. What about church membership? In the spring of 1946 we ministers knew that it was time to face it. In principle of course no question existed; it should be assumed that Negroes would be received into the church. The best procedure, nevertheless, seemed to be to hold a membership meeting for a full and open airing of the subject, with all the risks of democratic action which that involved. The discussion was heated, but finally by close vote the group decided to "reaffirm" our Congregational-Christian policy to be a Christian fellowship open to all persons regardless of race or color, thus determining that the church would be thoroughly inclusive from then on. Three Negroes were received into membership on that Palm Sunday in 1946.

Then in the next two years more and more Negroes were integrated into the life of the church. In every way we felt deeply the richness of a fellowship composed of substantial

groups of nisei, Negro, and white participants. A few families in the congregation at that time withdrew their interest; others, however, found their experience broadening and deepening in a new kind of fellowship. And some of the church members most vocal in their resistance have continued to show their loyalty to the church.

Between 1946 and 1948 the congregation of 125 on a normal Sunday morning included 15 to 30 nisei, and a similar number of Negroes, with the trend toward a smaller group of nisei and an enlarging group of Negroes. The Sunday church school has had fewer Negroes, but almost half of its enrollment of 150 have been nisei children. The senior choir of eighteen voices has been thoroughly mixed and has at present three nisei, six Negro, and nine white members. Also the church clerk and many of the church school teachers and young people are nisei. Negroes are among the deacons and deaconesses and serve on all the official boards of the church.

The organizations in the church have varied. The Young Adult group and the Cub Scout troop included all three racial groups almost equally. Women's organizations have had nisei and Negro participants only occasionally, and high-school-age groups have been the slowest to include Negroes, although nisei have been quite active. These young people have reflected the social pressures which condition their lives.

A New Period Ahead

In late 1947 and early 1948 we realized that preparation was needed for still other changes ahead. A 1947 population survey showed that the parish which in 1940 was 94.4 per cent white, by Federal census, was now only 36 per cent white. Roughly 57 per cent was Negro and 7 per cent nisei. And the white and nisei percentages were steadily declining. The church was making an adjustment, but was it keeping up with the community? Both white and nisei residents were gradually leaving the community. The Chicago Congregational Union and the church anticipated the time when it would be wise to add a Negro to the ministry of the church, so that the neighborhood would really know that the church was open and that we meant to maintain the church in the community. In the fall of 1948 Rev. Robert R. Johnson, a young Negro minister well trained at Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, came as associate minister. His ministry was clearly understood to be to the whole church and not just to the Negroes.

That fall we faced many unanswered questions. Howard Spragg was leaving at the end of 1948 for a new position in Puerto Rico; it was known that I would succeed him as the minister and that Robert

Johnson and I would continue on together. Church attendance declined and there were noticeably fewer white members in the congregation. Whites and nisei were leaving the neighborhood as more Negroes moved in. Speculative buyers, both Negro and white, bought property there and forced white and nisei tenants to move. New owners cut up the old apartments and charged double rents to new Negro tenants. So we wondered how long a neighborhood can stay mixed racially when such economic circumstances prevail.

During this transition period it became evident that Negroes were bringing a new psychology to the church. They had come to the neighborhood to stay, and they had made this their church. Their forward outlook brought a glimmer of hope for stability and permanence to a disorganized community.

With the new year, attendance has picked up and many activities have taken a spurt. Nevertheless, the situation at South Church needs to be described anew from month to month. On a Sunday morning at present the congregation might show an almost equal number of Negroes and whites, with sometimes more of the latter, and a continuing 5 or 10 per cent of nisei. Some organizations are still well mixed; some are still mainly white; some community groups such as the Scouts are completely Negro. The high-school groups remain as described above. A new men's club is mixed, and sparked by Negro leadership it is moving ahead with vigor.

We are now preparing for an Every Member Canvass, which will be also a time for taking stock and for sounding out our members concerning their relationship with the church. After careful planning, Negro, nisei, and white callers will visit all members and close friends, perhaps some 250 persons. Many of these are white members, now inactive; and we aim to reinterpret our church to them, and to ourselves, to become conscious anew of the treasure we possess, however much may change. We want to challenge ourselves, old members and new to readopt this church as our fellowship.

Evaluation at This Stage

Several observations may be made in evaluating these changes.

1. The basic and immediate question is how long can it remain mixed in its constituency. Of course the answer lies in the housing pattern of the community. Inevitably the neighborhood will soon be Negro. If so, cannot South Church maintain its continuity as a church, keeping the same name, tradition, and organization, even though the color of its membership changes?

2. Constant guidance has been called for in the selection of leadership, in the preparation of programs,

in small matters such as seating at dinners as well as in large matters of basic policy.

3. White and Negro members alike are going through an educational process in learning to work with a minister of another race. White members are growing as they come to accept their Negro minister, although by habit they are inclined to deal with their white minister. Negro members likewise are growing as they learn to accept their white minister, even though their natural inclination might be to deal with the Negro.

4. At points we see that Negroes and whites traditionally hold somewhat different conceptions of the Church. The Church is something of an elective to white people; but to Negroes it is the center of their life. The place of the pastor varies accordingly. Attitudes also differ about the place of music and the organizational life of the church. To be sure, there is no single "Negro idea" of the Church any more than there is one distinguishable "white" concept of the Church. Nevertheless, as we think about integrating Negroes and whites in churches, certain traditional differences will have to be taken into consideration.

5. Lastly, as acknowledged above, Negro attitudes differ just as white attitudes differ and our experience at South Church has indicated it. Some Negroes have become attached to South Church because it was a friendly white church; others come because of its interracial nature. Still others undoubtedly would prefer to be in a predominantly Negro church. For all of us, Negro, nisei, and white, the experience will be one of rich growth, if we are sensitive to one another in Christian love.

The Man America Needs

"Of no use are the men who study to do exactly as was done before, who can never understand that today is a new day. There never was such a combination as this of ours, and the rules to meet it are not set down in any history. We want men of original perception and original action, who can open their eyes wider than to a nationality—namely to a consideration of benefit to the human race—can act in the interest of civilization; men of elastic, men of normal mind, who can live in the moment and take a step forward."

—*Ralph Waldo Emerson.*

THEY SAID IT COULDN'T BE DONE

By MARK W. ABERNETHY, *Director, Bethlehem-Four States Parish, Mountaineer Mining Mission.*

THEY said it couldn't be done. *The Presbyterian Church just isn't geared for the working class. No religious group has ever succeeded in reaching coal miners for any length of time.* That's what they said.

What happened is a different story. The Mountaineer Mining Mission in a short space of time has grown from a single worker living in an unfinished basement to a full-time staff of four ministers covering three counties. From one Sunday church school, the work has grown to five fully organized churches, three additional Sunday church schools, and numerous recreation points. That unfinished basement has grown into a community house with a modern swimming pool nearby. Three churches at the present time are actively engaged in building chapel-community centers.

The participants in the Mission program are a cross section of the coal-mining community. That means Negro and white, Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox, Hungarians, Polish, and English. Furthermore, the Mission includes in its work not only members of the United Mine Workers, but supervisory personnel, coal operators, and some farmers.

The churches of the Mission during their first year of existence have supported their own Sunday church schools (they use the new curriculum); accepted and paid their benevolence quota; organized Westminster Fellowships; and have started underwriting their ministers' salaries. This has been in addition to a very active building program.

On the other hand, prospects of successful work in the coal fields were not evident. The coal fields are one of the greatest unevangelized areas in the United States. Miners and their communities have had to rely on occasional tent meetings and missions sent out sporadically from some neighboring city. This type of work was extremely individualistic, as well as paternalistic. Individuals were "saved," but they had to live in "unsaved" communities.

These mining towns were never set up as communities. Houses were hastily perched on the side of a hill around a tipple, which was back in the mountains away from any sizable city. In a short time a company store appeared, along with a beer hall. Later came schools, perhaps. Only very recently have union halls, community centers, and churches appeared.

The miners and their families were unable to make a community. They had no houses, no land, nothing but their work. The work itself was a disorganizing factor. Coal mining isn't steady work. It is plagued with slack periods. It is unsafe work. Water, gas, and bad roofs make life seem very temporary. Coal mining is hard work. When the miner came home from work he was too tired to spend much time in fellowship. There was no place to go, anyway, except the beer hall. Mothers were kept busy cooking and trying to keep coal dust out of their houses. Children were left to get along the best they could. If work got too slack, the miner and his family moved where work was more steady. There was nothing permanent, nothing to hold to, no sense of belonging.

In other words, coal-mining people and the towns in which they lived had none of the things that go to make up a community—none of the things that a large part of America takes for granted.

Consequently, the Mission had to start from scratch. Sunday church schools and preaching weren't enough. The miners and their communities had to be organized if churches were to be built. Christian living doesn't exist in a vacuum. The community, perhaps, had to be organized enough to dispose of its garbage before it began to dispose of its sins. Children had to be given something worth-while to do before they could be condemned for hanging around the beer hall. Recreation was needed as greatly as preaching services. Recreation preached a service to the community that couldn't be overlooked. The devil had provided all the necessities for a life of darkness. It was up to the church to provide the resources for a life of light.

The church was helped in its task to a great degree by the union. The UMW in organizing did away with company towns in most instances. The operators, faced with a growingly responsible group of workers, sold their houses. The mining folk, having a home of their own for the first time, began to settle down and fix up their communities. The operators helped. The UMW insisted that the union include everyone that worked in the mine. That meant, in the union at least, a working fellowship of all racial, cultural, and creedal groups. The union gave many men their only education in writing, speaking, conducting business, and handling financial affairs. The union brought the first adequate health and welfare measures.

The people themselves have a great deal in their favor. Coal mining is skilled work. The men have a great pride in a job correctly done. A careless job may mean death. They carry that same standard into their work for the church and the community. It makes sense to them

to say that a life and community without Christ means death.

Miners, like any isolated people, developed a simple but strict set of manners. They are often shocked and amazed at the boorish antics of city people. If the coal miner has developed bad traits, if he has become a hard drinker, not treated his family decently, it is not entirely his fault. He has needed someone to come bringing the good news of Christ—someone to help him organize his life and his community for the Kingdom.

That is what the Mountaineer Mining Mission has tried to do. It has tried to work with the people rather than for them. The first principle of organizing a community for Christ is always identification. This principle of identification involves living with the miners in their communities in the same kind of houses they live in. It means little things like wearing simple clothes, taking a real interest in mining and in the problems of the community. If the minister feels a lack of beauty and the niceties of life, it is not his personal problem. It is the problem of the whole community, and therefore a problem for the minister to solve in community with his people. If he has truly identified himself with his people, that is the only way it can be done.

The minister, however, must know what it is that the people of the community want and need. That involves a great deal of calling and associating. It means spending time down at the mine works and the company store. It means taking time out to sit on front porches, or around the kitchen table listening.

A miner talks it over with his pastor, Rev. Dick Smith of the Mountaineer Mining Mission. Together they plan for the happiness and well-being of the community, and the spiritual advance of the Church.
(COURTESY *Presbyterian Life* MAGAZINE.)

It means knowing the ins and outs of the union on the local, district, and national levels. Just as much time must be spent with the mine foremen, the company superintendent, and officers.

Nine times out of ten, the individuals and groups want and need the same things. The operators want stable and dependable workers. The union desires job security, decent working and living conditions. If they have these, they will be dependable workers. Individuals want justice, decency, and love. The Church wants lives founded on Christ and his way of life. It's all the same thing. The difficulties arise when individuals and groups strive against one another for what they want.

It is the job of the minister and the church to provide the place where everyone can meet and solve their seemingly separate problems together. In theological terms it is called "reconciliation." What seems impossible is possible when God through the minister and the church is the catalytic agent.

In one of the Mission communities they had dreamed of having a swimming pool. It was only a dream, until the church got the operators, the union, the white and Negro school principals, and the community working together to build a swimming pool. Working together through the church, they achieved something that none of them could have done separately. In the process, heretofore competitive groups learned the value of working together.

It is important in getting groups and individuals together to provide a maximum of democracy. To watch a mine-timberman, a colored Baptist representative, and a company engineer work on a church building committee in absolute equality is to see the reconciling ministry of Christ. The Mission believes that this approach is the only solution to labor-management difficulties, as well as struggles between other groups. The nature of our society is so highly competitive that conflict is almost inevitable. The church is the one agency that can bring people together to work in harmony and understanding.

It is only in the spirit of Christ that people can learn to love and respect one another. When they learn the value of working in harmony through the church, people will usually carry those principles into everything they do. Mine superintendents say that the church betters the working of the mine. One said, "You can tell the guys that have a stake in the church by their work."

This means that the church has the responsibility of getting out into the community and doing its work there, instead of within four walls. Fortunately, the Mission had no institution to bury itself in. The only

places it had to work were around in people's homes, in schools, storerooms, and under trees. The equipment was portable and was carried to the people.

Consequently, the church tends to become the community, and not just a part of it. The remark of one of the Mission deacons illustrates this point: "This church we're building is our community home." To support the "home," a collection is taken for the church at every local union meeting.

This community organization by the church results in an "unconscious evangelism." People in the community work in the church without realizing it, because the church is in the community.

A principal of one of the schools claimed that the church was narrow and sectarian. The school was the only broadly representative group in the community. In the next breath he complained that the children were always talking about church activities, wrote up Bible stories for themes, and that the P.T.A. seemed to think it was just a subcommittee of the church. Nobody can dodge the church when it gets out into the community.

The Mountaineer Mining Mission is not so proud of its work as it is amazed. The Mission approached its job of evangelizing the mining towns in the only way that it could, given the situation that existed. The fervor, devotion, and initiative of the people, when the Mission afforded them the opportunity to get together in Christian community, has built our churches. It is also giving to the Church at large a strong group of lay people who will bring the same power that has characterized their union—the UMW.

While the work of the Mission is uniquely frontier work, we feel that the principles we have happened upon are applicable to the entire Church. There is nothing new in the principle of a church and minister identifying themselves with the community. Christ did. There is nothing new in the church and minister as catalytic or reconciling agents. Christ is that too. There is nothing new in the church's going out into all of the community. The Early Church in The Acts did that.

There is nothing new, either, in the Church's withdrawing into an institutional mold. The Jerusalem Church did that and failed. There is our danger. Our seminaries train men to hold an institution together. We are overskilled in pulling in. We are underskilled in reaching out.

Christ and his Church all through the ages have transformed individuals in transformed communities. The world is attempting to organize communities around secular philosophies. Those philosophies say that the Church is a back eddy, that it has lost its impact.

What happens can be a different story.

PROS AND CONS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

By VERA MICHELES DEAN.

Arguments for and against the North Atlantic Pact are presented in these two articles by VERA MICHELES DEAN, *Research Director of the Foreign Policy Association, and* BLAIR BOLLES, *Director of the Washington Bureau of the Foreign Policy Association. The material is reprinted by special arrangement with the Foreign Policy Association from the* Foreign Policy Report *of February 15, 1949.*

Need for Security

The basic argument in favor of the North Atlantic Pact is that it is essential to promote the recovery of western Europe so as to avert (in the language of the State Department outline, *Building the Peace—Collective Security in the North Atlantic Area*) "a catastrophe, possibly resulting in the collapse of western European civilization." If world recovery is to progress, however, the outline goes on, "the sense of security must be restored." Here is the core of the case for the pact. "Since the threat of armed aggression is at the root of insecurity, collective action which will enable free nations to confront a potential aggressor with preponderant power, together with economic recovery and political stability provides the only satisfactory antidote to fear." In short, the North Atlantic Pact, backed by integration of the armed forces of western European nations furnished with American armaments, either as outright gift or on terms of lend-lease, is a necessary corollary of the European Recovery Program.

Americans who disagree with this argument admit the need for security in Europe; and few today would contend that no armaments are needed by the United States or the countries of western Europe. Opponents of the thesis presented by the State Department outline present two principal counterarguments. Some contend that the military program envisaged under the North Atlantic Pact would have an effect exactly contrary to that desired by Washington—the necessity of diverting existing economic resources to armaments would delay, and perhaps actually jeopardize, fulfillment of the European Recovery Program, both by reducing the amount of American and western European man power and materials available for peacetime production, and by

making it politically difficult to effect a revival of East-West trade on the Continent, which was one of the basic assumptions of the countries benefiting by the Marshall Plan.[1] Others believe that it will prove impossible to restore the sense of security regarded by the United States as essential to western European recovery, no matter how much we arm the nations along the Atlantic seaboard, until Russian troops, still estimated at about one million, are withdrawn from Germany and Austria, and therefore urge, instead, negotiations with the U.S.S.R. for a general settlement on the continent.[2]

The State Department outline answers the first of these counter-arguments by placing economic recovery ahead of rearmament.

"Economic recovery," it declares, "is fundamental and should continue to have priority over rearmament. What is needed is a carefully drawn balance in Europe between recovery and rearmament and a

---

How to Make Effective Use of These Articles

After you have read these articles—

- **Discuss them with members of your church, your neighbors and friends.**
- **Suggest that they be reviewed and discussed in various church groups—in young adult groups, Westminster Fellowship, circle meetings of the women's association, men's Bible class.**
- **Plan a church-night panel discussion or symposium with representatives of church groups presenting current opinions about the pact and examining them in the light of Christian doctrine and concern for brotherhood and a just and enduring peace. Ask your minister or a high-school principal or history teacher to be moderator.**
- **Join with other denominational groups in sponsoring your own Town Meeting on the pact. Arrange with your local radio-station manager to broadcast a portion of the meeting.**
- **Encourage a group in your church to make a bulletin-board display for a well-lighted corner of the parish house, featuring large colored map of territory involved in the pact, clippings from daily papers, marked copy of SOCIAL PROGRESS, General Assembly pronouncement on militarism from *Christian Social Action*.**
- **Compile a world-order book and pamphlet shelf and lending library. (Write SOCIAL PROGRESS for up-to-date reading list.)**
- **Urge your public library to display materials on the North Atlantic Pact.**
- **Watch your daily newspapers for Congressional action to be expected following statement from State Department.**
- **Write our Washington office for legislative developments, in care of Miss Fern M. Colborn, Assistant Secretary, Division of Social Education and Action, 1000 Eleventh Street, N. W., Washington 1, D. C.**
- **And make up your mind about the pact and write, wire, or call your Congressman.**

similar balance here between the needs of our own domestic economy, our own defense, our contribution to ERP, and our contribution to European rearmament." Opponents of the proposed pact would agree that such a program, in theory, sounds acceptable. They contend, however, that in practice, if past experience is a guide, the very process of rearmament will generate fears that still further rearmament will be needed to allay, creating a mounting spiral of expenditures in which military estimates will prevail over considerations of economic and social recovery, thus bringing about, or perpetuating, the very conditions of misery, want, and dissatisfaction in large sectors of the population of Europe which, according to the State Department analysis, foster Communism and thus play into the hands of the U.S.S.R.

To the second counterargument—the need to put a general settlement with the U.S.S.R. ahead of a North Atlantic Pact—no direct answer is given in the State Department outline, whose basic premise is that the activities of the Soviet Government since the war have endangered peace and prevented recovery, and that the proposed pact is necessary to check not only possible Russian aggression but, even more, fear of such aggression. Commenting on the contention of some that even partial settlements with the Kremlin, by relaxing tension in Europe, would also tend to relax the current recovery efforts and cause the United States to neglect its responsibilities on the Continent, Mr. Lippmann says: "It is, I believe, an unwarranted defeatism to think that the Europeans will not try to recover or that Americans will default on their responsibilities in Europe unless the conflict with the Soviet Union remains in a condition of permanent crisis."[3]

Too Much—or Too Little?

An argument made in favor of the North Atlantic Pact as now planned by those who want to rally public opinion in this country to its support is that, no matter how broad its scope, its fulfillment will remain subject to the American "constitutional process," that is, Congress will continue to exercise the right, under the Constitution, to declare war. This feature of the pact, which has the effect of leaving in the hands of the United States final decision concerning participation in war, tantamount to the veto power it now holds as a permanent member of the UN Security Council over decisions to apply military sanctions against an aggressor, may reassure those Americans who are still reluctant to see this country accept permanent military commitment. But it is this very feature which arouses the most serious objections on the part of the nations of western Europe that are expected to be signatories of the pact. These nations, especially the

Scandinavian countries close to the orbit of the U.S.S.R., realize that they will be taking a serious risk of antagonizing the Soviet Government by throwing in their lot with the United States in an arrangement which, no matter how it may be described in Washington, will be regarded in Moscow as a military alliance anti-Russian in character. If they are to take this risk, they would like to make as sure as one can be about things human that in case they are attacked by Russia, the United States will swing automatically into action, without waiting for a debate in Congress.

The United States, for its part, following the pattern it has set in the European Recovery Program, would like to make sure that the nations joining the North Atlantic Pact will do their share through self-help within the measure of their resources and through integration of their programs of defense. Although a certain measure of progress in this direction has been made by the five signatories of the Brussels pact, some American observers are wondering whether what appears to them undue delay in achieving economic integration under the ERP may not occur also in the military sphere, with too great dependence by western Europe on armaments from the United States.[4]

Another important argument made in the State Department outline in favor of the proposed pact is that it would be in harmony, not in conflict, with the Charter of the United Nations. The charter, says the outline, recognizes "that certain groups of countries have common interests of a strategic, political, economic, and social nature, and that certain security problems are of a distinctly regional character." Two articles of the charter are cited in support of the contention that nations "having such common interests" may take "collective action for defense under certain conditions": Article 51, which says that "nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security"; and Article 52, which provides that "nothing . . . precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action . . . consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations." The treaty of Rio de Janeiro, adopted at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security, held in Brazil in 1947, and providing for collective action by the American republics in the event of an armed attack against a Western Hemisphere nation, whether

from within or without the Americas, is cited as a notable example of how these articles and other related provisions of the charter may be put into practical effect.

To this argument two main objections have been made. First, it is contended that, while a regional defense pact such as now contemplated for the North Atlantic region would be "entirely legal under Article 51, and it would be much better for the United States to take it than to do nothing," such a pact is decidedly a second-best choice, and a choice that might eventually hamper, not help, the United Nations; for "a series of regional pacts might in time overshadow the organization's universal character and aims." This counter-argument has been presented most cogently and at greatest length by Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of *Foreign Affairs* and wartime consultant to the Department of State.[5] Mr. Armstrong agrees with the general position of the State Department that the U.S.S.R. has been blocking peace both within and without the United Nations. Nevertheless, he strongly urges "a move to strengthen the United Nations as a whole rather than to underwrite a group of its members," which would take the form of a protocol supplementing the Charter of the United Nations. In this protocol the signatories, members of the UN, would pledge themselves to carry out the promise to resist aggression contained in the charter "*whether other members do so or not.*" This protocol, open to all members of the United Nations including Russia, "would simply stipulate that if an attack on one of the signers occurs, and if the Security Council is blocked from action, the other signatories will nevertheless go to the aid of the victim. The decision might be made that it would come into effect automatically when seven of the eleven members of the Security Council (including four of the five permanent members having the right of veto) vote that aggression has occurred. Or there might be an agreement to bring it into effect by a two-thirds majority of the signatories. Or the General Assembly or Little Assembly might be left to make the decision by, say, a two-thirds vote." [6] In support of his proposal, Mr. Armstrong points out that the Vandenberg Resolution, cited also in the State Department outline, refers not only to "regional" arrangements but to "other collective arrangements" as well.[7]

Mr. Armstrong contends that the protocol he proposes would accomplish two purposes; it would not only meet the particular requirements of the western European nations, which is the objective of the North Atlantic Pact, but would at the same time "benefit the United Nations as a whole." Moreover, his proposal would meet two other points raised against the North At-

lantic Pact. By including Russia among nations invited to sign the protocol, he would eliminate the problem of singling out Russia as the threat to world peace, which is now done in the State Department outline; if Russia refuses to sign the protocol, it would single itself out as being unwilling to take action against aggression. And, by making the protocol operative automatically, Mr. Armstrong would meet the objections of western European nations which now fear that no matter how many guarantees the United States may give in a pact, Congress will still have the right to make up its mind as to whether or not this country should go to war. In general, Mr. Armstrong believes that it is preferable, in any collective defense arrangement, "to set up standards of conduct rather than standards of geography." This view is welcomed by those who are definitely troubled at the thought that geographic considerations might be invoked by some in the United States as justification for including Spain and Portugal in the pact, as well as to invite the participation of Italy, which is not now a member of the United Nations, and even to enlist the aid of German forces on the side of the Western powers against the U.S.S.R.

It should be noted, in this connection, that some critics of regional defense pacts—notably Senator Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida—have contended that such pacts would constitute violations of the Charter of the United Nations. In opposing the Vandenberg Resolution on collective security in a Senate debate on June 11, 1948, Senator Pepper argued that regional military arrangements would lead to the re-establishment of military alliances incompatible with collective security, the United Nations, and peace. The proper relationship of regional arrangements to the system of collective security envisaged in the UN Charter was discussed at length both at Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco. In the course of these discussions, special attention was given to the regional arrangements already existing at that time in the Western Hemisphere, and to the problems that might arise if the former enemy states should resort to aggression during the transitional period before peace treaties had been concluded and responsibility for keeping the peace had been transferred to the United Nations organization.[8] It was primarily with these considerations in mind at the two conferences that Articles 51 and 52 were drafted and redrafted in final formulation of the San Francisco charter.

How Would Pact Affect Asia?

A second major objection to a regional North Atlantic Pact tied in with the Charter of the United Nations is raised by those who want to

know how such a pact would affect the position of the colony-owning nations of western Europe in their relations to the dependent peoples of Asia. Would the United States, it is asked, in underwriting the security and economic recovery of western Europe, be expected also to underwrite the *status quo* in Indonesia, Indo-China, Malaya, and other colonial areas, whose present condition of unrest has a direct impact on the security and on the economies of Britain, France, and the Netherlands? Will the nations of western Europe be free to use the arms they may receive from the United States to subdue native uprisings? These questions indicate some of the difficulties involved in any attempt to "regionalize" defense arrangements since it is clearly impossible to isolate Europe from other continents from which it has traditionally imported food and raw materials and to which it has exported administrative and technical personnel, capital, and manufactured goods. This problem, which is bound to become more important as the tide of nationalism rises in Asia, and soon probably also in Africa, is not touched upon in the State Department outline.

Security: Internal or External?

Closely related to this problem, and also not discussed in *Building the Peace*, is the question whether the security of nations in a closely meshed international community can be adequately defended by military means against external threats or external aggression, or whether the fundamental problem is not the possibility of internal upheavals such as become familiar in the wake of two world wars. The answer usually given to this question is that the European Recovery Program is designed to alleviate the want and misery that would encourage such upheavals. This is true, although the operation of the ERP is limited both geographically, to the sixteen Marshall Plan countries, and economically, in the sense of being subject to termination in 1952, at which time American and European economic experts now predict that the standard of living even of these countries must be expected to decline unless non-United States sources of food and raw materials become available. There is danger, however, that the fear of instability and disorder understandably generated in the United States by the desire to see the ERP succeed within the time limit of four years set for it may cause some Americans to favor the maintenance of existing regimes and economic and social conditions, and to consider any attempt to alter the existing state of affairs as defiance of ERP. The intimate linking of ERP with rearmament might then conceivably induce the United States to permit the countries benefiting by American aid to use their arma-

ments for the suppression of internal disorders. Similar fears have already been expressed by liberals in Latin-American countries, who are asking themselves whether the Rio treaty undertaking to prevent all acts of aggression from within or without the Western Hemisphere might not encourage dictatorial regimes to invoke this treaty in justification of measures designed to suppress internal reform.

How Much Emphasis on Armaments?

A final question asked about the North Atlantic Pact raises a larger issue—and that is to what extent the Western nations are well advised to put increasing emphasis on armaments, especially if armament expenditures should seriously reduce the possibility of economic recovery and thus the preservation of political freedom where it exists, and its development where it is lacking at the present time. As indicated above, the State Department outline takes this problem into consideration, and proposes to balance the requirements of economic recovery and security against aggression as carefully as possible, so as not to weaken the basic economic strength either of the United States or of the nations to which it is giving assistance under the ERP. Decisions as to the percentage of available resources of the North Atlantic countries that should be allotted to armaments must, in the final analysis, be based on calculations of the various risks involved, with the realization, as Mr. Armstrong has well pointed out, that no policy can be entirely free of risk. In this connection, it is interesting to note the statement of John Foster Dulles, Republican adviser to the Administration on foreign policy, who in a recent interview with the editors of *The United States News* and *World Report* said: "I am inclined to think that we are exaggerating the percentage of our national income that needs to be diverted into military establishment. I think that there is, as I say, a risk of war, but I think the risk is not so great that we should seriously jeopardize our own economic health as a free society by saddling ourselves with such vast armament." [9]

---

[1] *"The Threat to the Marshall Plan,"* The Christian Century, *December 1, 1948, p. 1294. This point has been repeatedly made by James Warburg in speeches on inconsistencies of American foreign policy.*

[2] *This argument has been presented with particular force by Walter Lippmann. See his article "E.R.P. and Permanent Crisis,"* New York Herald Tribune, *January 13, 1949.*

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *This is notably the case with Barbara Ward's book,* The West at Bay *(W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1948), which otherwise draws up fairly elaborate blueprints of economic and political cooperation for western Europe.*

[5] *Hamilton Fish Armstrong, "Coalition for Peace,"* Foreign Affairs, *October, 1948, p. 1; "A Plan for Peace,"* Look, *January 4, 1949, p. 19.*

[6] Look, loc. cit.

[7] Foreign Affairs, loc. cit.

[8] *Department of State,* Charter of the United Nations: Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference, *cited p. 101.*

[9] The United States News *and* World Report, *January 21, 1949, p. 32.*

BACKGROUND OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

By BLAIR BOLLES.

WHEN Winston Churchill in his speech at Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, on March 5, 1946, recommended that the United States and Britain join in a "fraternal association," backed by a military alliance for their mutual defense in a tense world, both the American public and the Federal Government retained their confidence that the United Nations alone could keep the peace and deter aggression.[1] Moreover, the traditional American antipathy to peacetime compacts with European Governments was still strong. The country did not act on Mr. Churchill's suggestion. The gradual dissipation of that confidence, however, and the gradual disappearance in official circles of former antipathy to military alliances during the ensuing thirty-five months was disclosed by President Harry S. Truman in his Inaugural Address on January 20, when he proposed that the United States, by treaty, associate itself in a "collective defense arrangement" with "free" European countries in order to "strengthen the North Atlantic Area." The proposal for the creation of this regional military bloc, even "within the terms of the United Nations Charter," is a major development in American and world history.

The legal basis for the regional treaty is a series of articles in the United Nations Charter which the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference on the United Nations in 1945 recommended when confidence in world-wide co-operation was still strong. At that time the delegation in supporting these articles had in mind only the desirability of arrangements among the American republics.[2] Article 51 states that "nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member," and Article 52 authorizes "the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action."

The negotiations for the conclusion of the pact which Mr. Truman has now recommended opened on December 10, 1948, in the State Department between then Acting Secretary of State Robert Lovett, the Luxembourg minister, the ambassadors of the four other Western

Union powers, and the Canadian ambassador.[3]

The Rio Treaty

After the conversations had been in progress a month, the State Department implied, in a public paper entitled *Building the Peace—Collective Security in the North Atlantic Area,*[4] that the treaty under negotiation would follow generally the lines of the Inter-American Defense Pact. In it the American republics agreed that an armed attack against any American state will be considered an attack against them all; that in the event of attack, or suspicion of attack, the members of the treaty system will consult at once; that the decisions taken by two thirds of the members in consultation will bind them all, except that no state is required to use armed force without its consent; and that the regional security system is subordinate to the United Nations. An important feature of the Inter-American Defense Pact is that it calls for automatic consultation but not for automatic armed intervention on the part of the United States or any other signatory. Thus it satisfies the disposition of Congress to oppose any surrender of its constitutional authority to declare war.

The Truman Administration has also considered as possibly applicable to the North Atlantic Pact features of the Brussels Treaty (Western Union—Britain, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg), providing for the establishment of military and political committees, which make possible continuous consultation and planning instead of the intermittent emergency consultation required by the Inter-American Defense Pact. Senator Albert W. Hawkes, Republican, of New Jersey, expressed the opinion on June 11, 1948, that such an arrangement could modify in practice the ability of Congress to decide whether the country was to fight or not to fight. "If we advise about a matter," he told the Senate, "then if that matter is carried out subsequently in accordance with our advice, we shall have practically bound ourselves morally to give our consent."[5] The proposed North Atlantic Pact differs from the Inter-American Defense Pact also in that the United States "will provide military . . . equipment to free nations which will co-operate with us in the maintenance of peace and security," as Mr. Truman stated it in his Inaugural Address. For this he has a precedent in the program to help Greece and Turkey which he proposed on March 12, 1947, and which has been in effect since Congress authorized it on May 2, 1947. The United States has given almost $400,000,000 worth of military equipment to those two nations. Weapons which this country has distributed elsewhere abroad since

(Continued on page 26)

FREEDOM WITH FEAR

RELIGIOUS freedom should be the most cherished of the four freedoms. This freedom, issuing from the acknowledgment of God as the Creator and Father of mankind, clothes man with the dignity and honor that alone guard him from the brutal violation of personality by other men. Our national anthem rightly praises God as the "Author of liberty." But this freedom on which all freedom rests is endangered by neglect and misuse.

We believe that "God alone is Lord of the conscience" and declare our independence from the authority of society in matters that involve the soul's allegiance to God. "We must obey God rather than men." But man is perversely disposed to celebrate this "right" as an emancipation from the authority of man and neglects the unfettered service of God that it permits. The freedom we claim is not the liberty to do as we please but the freedom to do the will of God. Religious freedom means that no lawful authority, no Christian Church, no power in heaven or earth may challenge the awful claim of God as the supreme Authority over the soul of man.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES

The individual's accountability to God with whom he alone has to deal needs emphasis in a generation indulging its rights to the neglect of its duties—duties for the performance of which alone "rights" have standing. The authority of God has been retired in favor of the individual's pleasure or opinion, and the public's approval. Public policy and private conduct are justified by unworthy considerations of "public opinion" and personal prejudice. We resort to the weak excuse of Aaron, "Thou knowest the people, . . . for they said unto me" (Ex. 32: 22, 23), or of Peter, "Not so, . . . for I have never" (Acts 10: 14). Public opinion and prejudice control us. Indeed, "the world is too much with us." A faithless course of action is not wise and an evil way is not good, though your "Directors" require it or your "Board" approves it. No man or institution has the power to change the nature of an act or give you absolution for it. Ten thousand approving votes can no more make an evil matter right than "ten thousands of rivers of oil." Man must be shaken from both his devotion to his own comfort and his trust in the judgment of men upon his life. We are betrayed

to Faith

by the favor of men, the fear of losing goods or station. Thus we come again under bondage to man because we will not devotedly serve God. So few of us break from the "pull of gravity" of this world's standards. Generally we slip into the habits of thought and ways of action popularly approved. We must repent and earnestly seek and faithfully undertake the will of God in race relations, in business, in politics, in the ordering of this country's policy among nations?

The General Assembly has placed in the Division of Social Education and Action some of the issues that most sharply challenge the Church. The General Assembly does not assume the right to compel by law its members to conform to its pronouncements on social issues. Even though a thousand commissioners declare unanimously on a question, they must then leave the individual decision with the soul and God. "So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." Our best, indeed, our only, course, in the Christian community to secure the ends we believe approved of God is faithfully to set forth the significant facts of the issues for study and action by the Christian who owns that "God alone is Lord of the conscience" and subscribes to the doctrine, "We must obey God."

NORTH ATLANTIC PACT

IN THE light of the warning of the General Assembly of 1948 (see *Christian Social Action*, the Report of the Standing Committee, 1948, p. 6) we should examine our nation's policy (which includes increased expenditure for armaments of a total of $16,729,700,000; see p. 45 of this issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS) and study the probable effects of the acceptance of the North Atlantic Pact on this nation and the United Nations. The North Atlantic Pact is an enormously critical step and must not be taken without wide public debate. This issue of SOCIAL PROGRESS has been considerably enlarged to include the articles on the North Atlantic Pact by Mrs. Vera Micheles Dean and Blair Bolles. They are a timely and significant contribution to the study of the issue. Be sure to follow the suggestions for study and action on page 19. Make up your mind on this issue on the basis of the facts and in the light of Christian conscience. Then notify your Representative and Senator of your decision.

—Paul Newton Poling.

Background of the North Atlantic Pact

(Continued from page 23)

the termination of lend-lease have been sold, although often the sales price is very low.

Development of the Policy

The proposal by British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin in the House of Commons on January 22, 1948, that Britain, France, and the Benelux countries set up the military-economic-political "Western Union," laid the groundwork for eventual action, although Secretary Bevin did not suggest the inclusion of the United States in his union. The State Department commented on January 23 that "the United States heartily welcomes European initiative in this respect and any proposal looking to a closer material and spiritual link between the western European nations will serve to reinforce the efforts which our two countries have been making to lay the foundation for a firm peace." [6] Already Senator Leverett Saltonstall, Republican, of Massachusetts, had advocated that the United States back up the Marshall Plan with arms,[7] and John Foster Dulles had recommended to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the conclusion of an American-European treaty modeled after the Inter-American Defense Pact.[8]

The proposal for the pact arose during that period on the Administration's efforts to obtain Congressional enactment of the European Recovery Program law. When Senators Hawkes, Joseph Ball of Minnesota, Kenneth S. Wherry of Nebraska, and Harry Cain of Washington, all Republicans, offered an amendment to the recovery program to create a Supreme Council of United Nations members which would pledge themselves to use their

Milk and Cod-Liver Oil on Hand from UNICEF to See 4,000,000 European Children Through Winter

This winter the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund will have enough milk available for one cupful a day for each of the 4,000,000 children under its program in 12 European countries. Scarcely less important, there will be enough cod-liver and shark-liver oil for a daily dose, vitamin-full, for each and all. This milk, and the fish oil, along with bread, potatoes, and fruits which their Governments are contributing toward the daily supplementary meal, should go far toward getting these children through the winter in good shape, nutritionally speaking.

So far, the Fund has shipped 112,000,000 pounds of milk and has more on the way. Much the largest part is dry skim milk, a product high in protein and mineral value, yet relatively inexpensive. It comes mainly from the United States, the largest producer of this product. To date, the Fund has taken more than one half of the latter's 1948 exportable surplus.

armed forces outside the UN to defend a co-member from "aggression or subversion in any form," Senators friendly to the economic program as such defeated the amendment, although it included features later tentatively embodied in the North Atlantic Pact.[9] The report on the United Kingdom which the House of Representatives Select Committee on Foreign Aid published on March 6 said that "the economic co-operation of western European countries envisaged in the European recovery program can be achieved only if it is paralleled by political co-operation and a firm alliance for defensive purposes. Only if western Europe can be given the necessary political and military security will it be willing to rationalize its economy on a continental basis and thereby become economically self-sustaining once again."[10] The Administration subsequently adopted this opinion that the military arrangement is necessary to the success of the economic program.[11]

The Administration associated the United States directly, but vaguely, with the movement for regional European security in the address President Truman made to Congress on March 17, 1948, the day the Western Union powers, shocked by the Communist overthrow of the government in Czechoslovakia, signed in Brussels the treaty which Mr. Bevin had recommended on January 22. "This development deserves our full support. I am confident that the United States will, by appropriate means, extend to the free nations the support which the situation requires. I am sure that the determination of the free countries of Europe to protect themselves will be matched by an equal determination on our part to help them do so."[12] President Truman did not expatiate until his Inaugural Address the following January, and publicly the State Department almost wholly ignored the matter until it published *Building the Peace—Collective Security in the North Atlantic Area*, on January 14, 1949. But the Senate, on June 11, 1948, accelerated the development of the regional treaty policy by passing Resolution 239, known as the Vandenberg Resolution, by 64 to 4, after one afternoon's debate.

Encouraged by the resolution, the State Department in July initiated conversations with the Brussels powers and Canada to explore the steps that the United States might take in support of Western Union.

In the same month military representatives of the United States and Canada began to take part in the consultations of the Permanent Military Committee of the Brussels Powers. Canadian officials spoke more freely and more vigorously than Americans about the desirability of a North Atlantic Pact. "The best guarantee of peace today is the creation and preservation by the nations of the Free World, under the

leadership of Great Britain, the United States, and France, of an overwhelming preponderance of force over any adversary or possible combination of adversaries," Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs L. S. St. Laurent said on June 11 in Toronto.[13] The negotiations for the drafting of a treaty which opened in Washington on December 10 followed the actions of the Brussels powers in choosing the officers in command of the branches of their combined forces and in approving a common defense policy, although no amalgamation of forces has taken place. The administrative apparatus of Western Union is extensive. It consists of not only the Permanent Military Committee but also of the Commanders in Chief Committee and a Consultative Council.

Part Membership a Problem

An imposing problem which the United States has yet to face is the membership of the bloc. On January 14, Michael McDermott, spokesman for the State Department, referring particularly to Sweden, said that nations which did not join the pact would not receive military equipment from the United States. This statement neglects the fact that Greece and Turkey now receive such equipment with participation in a pact, but it is in keeping with the attempt made by the United States, through the European Recovery Program, to encourage the most extensive possible unity of action on the part of European states. However, can a pact ostensibly drafted to uphold the United Nations include nations not in the UN? This affects Italy, strategically important country for the United States. Should the pact be open to all who want to join? When Senator Ball proposed the establishment of his Supreme Council, he said, "If Russia wants to join, I shall be extremely happy." Hamilton Fish Armstrong, in the October, 1948, issue of *Foreign Affairs*, recommended that the security pact be general rather than regional in membership.

---

[1] *"Trend Toward Rival Blocs Endangers UNO,"* Foreign Policy Bulletin, *March 15, 1946.*
[2] Report to the President on the Results of the San Francisco Conference, *State Department Publication No. 2349 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1945), pp. 101-108.*
[3] *Department of State* Bulletin, *December 19, 1948, p. 778.*
[4] *Foreign Affairs Outlines,* Building the Peace—Collective Security in the North Atlantic Area, *prepared by the Department of State, No. 19.*
[5] Congressional Record, *80th Congress, 2d Session, p. 7989.*
[6] *Dept. of State* Bulletin, *Feb. 1, 1948, p. 138.*
[7] The New York Times, *January 15, 1948.*
[8] Hearings on the European Recovery Program, *Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 80th Congress, 2d Session. Somewhat similar statements were made to public gatherings by Bernard Baruch on February 16 and, in England, by Anthony Eden on February 28.*
[9] Congressional Record, *March 3, 1948.*
[10] Final Report on Foreign Aid of the House Select Committee on Foreign Aid, *May 1, 1948, p. 110.*
[11] Building the Peace—Collective Security in the North Atlantic Area, loc. cit.
[12] The New York Times, *March 17, 1948.*
[13] *Reference Papers No. 33, Information Division, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa.*

To Meet the Crisis in Education

Lay leaders and staffs of private and public agencies, civic organizations. and churches met to discuss important legislation to come before the 81st Congress. The National Social Welfare Assembly called the conference in New York on January 31 and February 1.

Startling facts were revealed about the present crisis in American education, documenting immediate need for prompt remedial measures.

Nearly 30,000,000 boys and girls are enrolled in elementary and secondary schools, the largest enrollment in our history. And yet, over two million youth between the years 6 to 17 are not in school at all, and millions of those enrolled are receiving a substandard education.

Federal aid to the states for general elementary and secondary education could reduce the marked inequalities of educational opportunity.

It was proposed by the conference that the Federal Government should now provide assistance to the states and localities in order that all American children will be assured of more nearly equal opportunities for at least a minimum program of elementary and secondary education. Precedents for Federal participation in school support are numerous.

The nation is also faced with the worst school building shortage in its history. It is estimated that the 1954 enrollment in the public elementary and secondary schools will require 200,000 additional classrooms. Furthermore, curricular changes, broadened educational objectives, new courses and methods, and community use of school buildings require expansion and alteration of existing facilities and broader planning for new plants.

The President recommended in his budget message to Congress that a complete survey be made of the problem of buildings for elementary and secondary education and the ability of states and localities to meet the needs for new construction.

Half or more of the most able high-school graduates fail to continue their education, chiefly because of the lack of financial resources, yet in practically every field there is a critical need for a larger supply of people with high ability and adequate education.

Scholarship funds in the hands of institutions of higher education are relatively meager. The President's Commission on Higher Education a year ago unanimously recommended the provision of Federal scholarships to well-qualified students to the extent of about 20 per cent of the non-veterans attending colleges and universities.

For provisions in the Federal Aid to Education bill, S. 246, see page 42.

I FAVOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

By CHARLES J. TURCK, *president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota.*

IN ANY discussion of new proposals for Governmental action, there are two characteristic attitudes that reveal a great deal more about the proposer or his opponent than about the proposal. One is the attitude that sums up the opposition to expansion of Governmental activity in the ancient phrase, "That government is best which governs least." The other is the attitude that supports certain new phases of Governmental activity with the expression: "This is a desirable result. Without Government aid we cannot achieve it. Let's give our Government a chance to do it with us."

It is obvious that the first attitude reveals a mind that takes a vague general principle out of its historical context and uses it to solve the most complicated problems of our society. To such a mind, Federal aid to education is a horrible proposition because it contemplates considerable expansion of Governmental activity. Somebody will have to pay for this expanded activity, and all good taxpayers rise to join the chant, "That government is best which governs least."

One great difficulty with persons who solve our complicated problems with a slogan or fetish is that they frequently hold to these so-called principles on religious or quasi-religious grounds. "My grandfather attended school for only eight grades, and look how great a man he proved to be." To make it easy for young people to go beyond eight grades to high school or to college is a form of disloyalty to "my grandfather"; it is setting aside the ancient landmarks; it is altering conditions that make for character.

The basic trouble with minds like that is that they are not operating as minds at all. They are representing prejudices that have become cemented into a phrase or a fixed pattern of thought. Federal aid to education upsets the idea that the Federal Government should do little or nothing in this field and raises the bogey that while state Governments are not likely to become tyrannical misrulers of the people, the Federal Government is in imminent danger of becoming a totalitarian regime.

The second type of mind is pragmatic. It sees a certain possible result as being a reasonably good

thing for the community (not for self but for the community). It realizes that alone and unaided by Government, ordinary citizens are not likely to accomplish this result. It therefore welcomes the plan or plans whereby Government, democratically controlled by representatives of the people, puts some of its united force behind the project. Thus, if we believe that a great many young people should be in college who are not there now, and if we believe that individual students are not likely to get there by reason of economic barriers, indifference, and discriminatory practices, then we are ready for the conclusion that Government should devise a plan to aid more young Americans to secure the benefits of a college education.

This is exactly what Americans have done from the earliest days of our history. If they find that they cannot accomplish certain great social results by their own unaided efforts, they turn to their Government, state and national, to get aid. When the settlers wanted more land, they called on the Federal Government to negotiate treaties of cession with the Indians. When our forefathers wanted better roads, they called on the Federal Government to aid in building the roads. When they wanted better schools, they called on the state and local Governments to provide them, since education was a primary responsibility of the state as distinguished from the national Government. When in the latter half of the nineteenth century our people wanted higher education in great universities, colleges of agriculture, and courses for county agents and home demonstration agents, they called on the Federal Government to provide all or part of the expense.

But some critic will say, "It is all right to have state aid for education, but not Federal aid, for Federal aid means control." This argument is difficult for me to follow, even though I am a Southerner. (Incidentally, I have never heard the state rights argument used except to block a worthy social goal—like the elimination of slavery and child labor, provision of fair rates on public utilities, fixing of hours of labor and fair conditions of work, the social control of the intoxicating liquor traffic, woman suffrage, fair employment practices, etc.) If one believes in Government aid for education, and if one recognizes that the people have as much influence over their representatives in Congress as over their representatives in the state legislature, what difference does it make which Governmental agency operates to provide aid for schools or for students? Is not the Federal Government our own government, as much as the state government is our own?

At this point, the critic can wait no longer to devour this naïve Southerner who rejects state rights

and welcomes aid from the one Government that can and will provide it—Uncle Sam. Do I not know the bureaucrats? Have I not read Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn's pious wish: "May the Federal Bureau of Education never become the Federal Commissar of Education in America!" Do I not know that the National Education Association with a membership of 386,643, paying dues of $1,138,000 annually, has headquarters and personnel greater than the Republican and Democratic headquarters combined? Can anything be more sinister than this?

Let us be calm about these dangers. I know the bureaucrats of the Federal Bureau of Education and some other Federal departments. I like them. They are good Americans, understanding our federal system of government much more clearly than the state righters. They may occasionally suggest; they do not command. In my experience as a college president throughout the National Youth Administration and the veterans' G. I. Bill of Rights provisions, I have never received a command or a suggestion from a Federal official on any matter of textbook, course, professorial activity, methods of teaching, student grades, or like academic matters. We have a few forms to fill out "in quadruplicate," but reports are not censorship, not bureaucratic control, not a new invention of Russian spies. One would think that with eighty years of experience with Federal aid to universities, colleges of agriculture, county agents, home demonstration agents, and college students, many instances of Federal "control" could be cited. I know of none.

There are three basic questions to answer: Do we believe in education for all? Do we believe that this educational opportunity should be opened to every young American to the extent that he can profit from such educational experience? Do we believe that in the process of opening that door of opportunity the full power of organized society shall be used, and that adequate taxes should be raised to support our public schools and to aid deserving students in high-school and post-high-school education?

I can imagine no American Christian answering any of these questions in the negative. We may differ as to what agency of Government should operate (the state or the nation, or both). I feel that we should not hesitate to go to the agency that has the money—and that is the Federal Government—while we also continue basic local and state supports. Practically speaking, there is no chance for equal educational opportunity in our public schools unless the Federal Government operates as the equalizing agent among the states. Practically speaking, there is little chance of our colleges' replacing the one million returned veterans now on campus unless the

Federal Government provides scholarships.

The need is very great. In 1947-1948, when we had 2,354,000 young people enrolled in college, this figure represented less than 16 per cent of the college age group (18-21 years inclusive), and more than 1,000,000 of these were returned veterans. But for those who were using the G. I. Bill of Rights privileges there would have been less than 10 per cent of the college age group in college. On our total basic educational program, the United States spends 2 per cent of its national income, and Russia spends 7 per cent! If we spent as much as Russia spends on education, our total educational expenditures would be $16 billions instead of $5 billions, which is our highest estimated total of taxes and private funds devoted to education.

Based upon a sampling of test scores made by more than ten million men in the armed services who took the General Classification Test in World War II and correlated with marks made on the 1942 College Edition of the American Council on Education Psychological Examination, the President's Commission announced:

"At least 49 per cent of our population has the mental ability to complete 14 years of schooling with a curriculum of general and vocational studies that should lead either to gainful employment or to further study at a more advanced level.

"At least 32 per cent of our population has the mental ability to complete an advanced liberal or specialized professional education."

These figures seem to represent a reasonably cautious estimate of the number of young Americans who ought to have some kind of post-high-school educational experience. If true, these figures would mean a college enrollment by 1960 of 4,600,000 as compared with the 1948-1949 enrollment of 2,410,000.

Federal aid to the public schools and Federal scholarships to potential college students are the only measures that have been proposed to meet a situation of genuine need. Protestant educators should be in the forefront of those who proclaim the need and the remedy. To echo the sentiments of timid reactionaries, to join with implacable foes of the public-school system—these are the guarantors of failure. But as Christian citizens we can rest the cause of democratic free society upon the foundations of a greatly strengthened public-school system. We can dedicate our Church-related colleges as public-service community institutions. We can welcome, not grudgingly but gladly, all who wish to aid American colleges, whether by benevolent gifts, tuition payments, or tax-supported scholarships for students, granted by our Federal Government which we create and which we control.

Sanctuary

The City

Call to Worship:

Leader: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee."

People: "For, behold, the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people."

Leader: "But the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee."

People: "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising."

Invocation:

"Eternal God, in whom we live and move and have our being; Whose face is hidden from us by our sins; And whose mercy we forget in the blindness of our hearts; Cleanse us, we beseech Thee, from all our offenses; And deliver us from proud thoughts and vain desires; That with lowliness and meekness we may draw near to Thee; Confessing our faults, confiding in Thy grace, and finding in Thee our refuge and our strength; Through Jesus Christ Thy Son. Amen."—*From* The Book of Common Worship, *1946.*

Hymn:

Our fathers built this city in ages long ago,
And, busy in its busy streets, they hurried to and fro;
The children played around them and sang the songs of yore,
Till, one by one, they fell asleep, to work and play no more.

Yet still the city standeth, a hive of toiling men,
And mother's love makes happy home for children now as then;
O God of Ages, help us such citizens to be
That children's children here may sing the songs of liberty!

Let all the people praise Thee, give all Thy saving health,
Or vain the laborer's strong right arm and vain the merchant's wealth;
Send forth Thy light to stablish the glory of the Word,
Until this city is become the city of the Lord!

Scripture: Amos 3: 1-7.

"Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your

iniquities. Can two walk together, except they be agreed? Will a lion roar in the forest, when he hath no prey? will a young lion cry out of his den, if he have taken nothing? Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, where no gin is for him? shall one take up a snare from the earth, and have taken nothing at all? Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it? Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets. The lion hath roared, who will not fear? the Lord God hath spoken, who can but prophesy?"

Meditation: The People's Responsibility.

Scripture: Amos 8: 4-8.

"Hear this, O ye that swallow up the needy, even to make the poor of the land to fail, saying, When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn? and the sabbath, that we may set forth wheat, making the ephah small, and the shekel great, and falsifying the balances by deceit? That we may buy the poor for silver, and the needy for a pair of shoes; yea, and sell the refuse of the wheat? The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, Surely I will never forget any of their works. Shall not the land tremble for this, and every one mourn that dwelleth therein?"

Meditation: A Confession of Sins.

Scripture: Amos 5: 14, 15.

"Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live: and so the Lord, the God of hosts, shall be with you, as ye have spoken. Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish judgment in the gate: it may be that the Lord God of hosts will be gracious unto the remnant of Joseph."

Meditation: An Assurance of Pardon and a Reconsecration.

Hymn of Consecration:

"Take my life, and let it be Consecrated, Lord, to Thee.
Take my moments and my days; Let them flow in ceaseless praise.

"Take my hands, and let them move At the impulse of Thy love.
Take my feet, and let them be Swift and beautiful for Thee.

"Take my voice, and let me sing, Always, only, for my King.
Take my lips, and let them be Filled with messages from Thee.

"Take my silver and my gold; Not a mite would I withhold.
Take my intellect, and use Every power as Thou shalt choose."

Prayer:

Be merciful, O Lord, unto our sins, and grant us evermore as a people to use the power Thou givest us to Thy glory, to the advancement of Thy Kingdom, and the honor of our nation, seeking always the deliverance of the oppressed, and, as much as lieth in us, the good of all mankind; through our only Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

Benediction.

—Prepared by Joseph Bachman, minister, Presbyterian Church, Bismarck, North Dakota.

WILKES-BARRE CHURCH REPORTS PROGRESS IN SEA

A Social Education and Action Committee was formed in the First Presbyterian Church of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, in September, 1948. Its membership included representatives of various church organizations and several other interested persons. It was organized at the instigation of the pastor of the church, Rev. Jule Ayers, and the session. The committee reports the following activities:

1. Every member of the committee subscribes to SOCIAL PROGRESS. Articles of interest are discussed at the monthly meetings of the committee.

2. All members of the committee have studied the social pronouncements of the 1948 General Assembly as published in the pamphlet *Christian Social Action*, published by the Division of Social Education and Action.

3. The committee has prepared and published in the church bulletin two special statements, the first having to do with "Why Social Action," and the second endorsing the Fair Employment Practices Commission bill before the Pennsylvania legislature and calling upon members of the church to use their influence to promote its enactment into law.

4. The committee sponsored a meeting to which all members of the church were invited and at which a church member, Miss Jean Grumbling, told about her experience in a German work camp. At this meeting the officers of the committee explained the nature and purpose of its work, and distributed literature.

5. Members of the committee attended a luncheon meeting sponsored by the Wyoming Valley Council of Churches at which Dr. Cameron Hall spoke on "The Church and Economic Life."

6. At a recent meeting of the committee one of its members presented a report of a study of community problems calling for Christian action.

7. In co-operation with the Council on Christian Education in the church, the committee is now sponsoring a nine session course for church members on "Our Church and Our Community," taught by Douglas F. Falconer, a member of the church and a leader in community affairs. **The outline is reprinted here with the hope that other church groups may be prompted to have similar discussions of their communities.**

Our Community

I. We live, work, play, and worship in this community. What is the community? Where does it begin and end? Is it Wilkes-Barre? Wyoming Valley? Is it determined by the distance people will travel to church, or shop? Is it limited by a psychological feeling of belonging? Do we belong to many local communities? One for church, one for business, one for recreation, etc.? Is there a Protestant, Catholic, Jewish community? Negro, white, Welsh, Polish, Italian? Employer, employee? Union, nonunion? If so, is this desirable and inevitable?

II. What makes a community tick? What of our church, our city? How do we get things done? If we need to do something, how do we get it started? And completed? Is it personal leadership—

some strong, determined, self-starting individual? Can leadership succeed against the wishes and desires of the people? How do we develop leaders? From what groups do our leaders come?

III. Can well-organized minority groups dominate the community? Do they? How about our political life? Who selects our candidates? Or our social life? Who determines our social associations? Do we? Or are there invisible forces that we recognize and observe? If so, who builds them?

IV, V. What is the organized labor situation in our community? Do young people from our church join unions? Why, or why not? Have we group attitudes toward unions? What are they? What is our attitude in industrial disputes in our community? Would we cross picket lines? Ever? In particular cases? How would we select them? In our opinion has the net effect of unions been socially helpful or harmful in our community? Is there a Christian responsibility for people to join, or not join, local unions? Or is the question completely outside Christian teaching?

VI, VII. What are the forces that tend to separate us from our fellow citizens? And what forces tend to bring us together? Is there anti-Semitism in this community? Anti-Catholicism? A white-Negro cleavage? What part does fear play in this situation? Do most of us live with fear? Who and what are we afraid of? How many people do we know who apparently have no fears? How can fear be overcome?

VIII, IX. Where does our church fit into this community? What is our job? What limitations on our mandate? What aspects of our community life should we stay out of? Political, economic, social? Should we stick to teaching and inspiring individuals with Christian ideals? Can the church, as an organization, effectively deal with community problems and attitudes? Is there a difference between the community responsibilities of the church, the membership of the church, the minister? What differences?

For specific help in organizing an effective Social Education and Action committee in your church you will want to read and reread the attractive new SEA manual,* Social Action in the Local Church, *published by the Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pa. You will find ideas by the score. Write the Division for advice in organizing your committee. Order your free copy today from any Westminster Book Store.

GO AND SEE TOURS

We have had two very successful "Go and See Tours" in the presbyterial. Rev. Francis Hayward, presbytery SEA secretary, proposed the plan, and has since served as the leader of the actual tours.

The first tour took in some of the agencies dealing with the local juvenile welfare program. The group visited the Jackson County Parental Home where wards of the court are quartered until their cases are disposed of. The chief probation officer served as our informant there. We visited the Youth Bureau of the Police Department, and Hilltop Home for Girls, where dependent wards of the county are placed. At each place the director gave us information about the problems facing youth in Kansas City, and explained the purpose and work of the agency, and its plans for the future.

The presbyterial group seemed very enthusiastic, but the results were not too significant. However, we do know that every organization represented had some report of the tour, that the Hilltop girls have been welcomed into the youth group of a local church, and that the women were eager for another tour.

The second tour, to a Negro community, was larger, including inspection of one of the largest Baptist churches in the country, and an explanation of its program; a tour through the newly organized Carver Neighborhood Center (the women were fascinated by the nursery, of course); lunch at Fellowship House, where we observed an experiment in an interracial program similar to Philadelphia Fellowship House. During luncheon Rev. Charles Gray, pastor of St. Paul's (a Negro congregation), did a fine job explaining some of the situations we had seen from the Negro's viewpoint. Later we went to the Urban League and discussed housing, employment practices, juvenile delinquency incidence in the Negro population. We heard the local president of the NAACP discuss discrimination as we have it locally—quite a shock too! We toured the plant of the *Kansas City Call*, a leading Negro newspaper, and were received by the publisher's wife in their most "House Beautiful" style apartment.

The results from this tour were more noticeable. All on their own the women wanted to "do something" as a follow-up. We organized a work project at Carver Center which reached nine churches actively (meaning that women from each church came and actually did hard physical work!). We worked and ate with an interracial full-time work camp run by the Church of the Brethren. Actually they planned the work and we helped them one day a week.

There we had not only an interracial group, an interfaith group, but also an interdenominational group, which stirred up considerable interest.

The groups going on the tours were limited to thirty, with two representatives from each of the churches.

We have planned at least two more tours which will interest Church women—one to the Jewish community, and the other on labor and unions.

—Mary Anderson Johnson,
SEA secretary, Kansas City, Missouri.

RELIGION AND LABOR FOUNDATION TO MEET

The annual conference of the National Religion and Labor Foundation will be held in Cincinnati, Ohio, on March 28-30, 1949. Organized labor as well as Church organizations and individuals have contributed generously to the budget of the Foundation and to the expenses of the projected convention. At the meeting, the Foundation will present the second annual award, with appropriate citation and ceremony, to the person who, in the judgment of the award committee, has made an outstanding contribution to mutual understanding and co-operation between religion and labor.

John Ramsay, prominent in Presbyterian leadership, was elected chairman of the National Religion and Labor Foundation, as a representative of labor, at a recent meeting of the Foundation's general executive board. Mr. Ramsay is a member of the steel workers' union. He is in charge of community relations for the C.I.O. Organizing Committee, with headquarters in Atlanta, Georgia.

—Clifford Earle.

LIQUOR ADVERTISERS BEGIN TO RETREAT

The January 3, 1949, issue of *Tap and Tavern* (organ of the Pennsylvania liquor interests) reports that advertising copy and display advertising slogans for whisky will be modified in the coming months. Such large distillers as Calvert and Schenley have agreed to drop their current campaigns; and several smaller distillers have been persuaded to change their copy.

So, the Capper Bill hearings before the Senate subcommittee last spring were not entirely without result. A signal service was performed by Senators Reed (Kansas) and Johnson (Colorado) in cross-questioning representatives of the Federal Trade Commission and Federal Tax Unit. Senator Johnson brought out the fact that the Federal Trade Commission was, usually, declining to take jurisdiction and sending complaints to the Alcohol Tax Unit which, in turn, was customarily taking no action since the reorganization of the Federal Alcohol Administration several years ago.

The Capper Bill itself, which proposed to eliminate liquor advertising in its entirety, was not reported favorably by the subcommittee. Senator Reed made a determined effort to have his substitute bill reported out favorably. The motion to table the bill was sustained by a 6 to 5 vote.

"HELPING ALCOHOLICS"

A new pamphlet by Seward Hiltner, *Helping Alcoholics*, has been published by the Division of Social Education and Action, and is available without cost to ministers and others who counsel with alcoholic addicts. The pamphlet is twenty-four pages long and covers the following theses: "It's on Your Doorstep"; "Pastoral Counseling with Alcoholics"; "Pastoral Help to Families"; Pastoral Help in Emergency Situations"; "Community Agencies of Help"; "Help for Excessive Drinkers"; "Other Pastoral Problems of Alcohol"; "The Pastor's Approach to Problems of Alcohol."

Dr. Hiltner is a Presbyterian minister. He is executive secretary of the Department of Pastoral Services of the Federal Council of Churches. He has been a member of the Advisory Board of the Yale Summer School of Alcohol Studies since its formation. His newest book, *Pastoral Counseling*, is the January, 1949, selection of the Religious Book Club.

The new publication is one of a series of pamphlets being published by the Division of Social Education and Action to implement the alcohol-education program initiated by the 158th General Assembly in 1946. The timeliness of the program and the urgency of the alcohol problem are indicated by the fact that within a month of the date of the publication of *Helping Alcoholics* three thousand Presbyterian ministers requested copies.

—*Clifford Earle.*

ALCOHOL EDUCATION IN EUROPE—HIGH LIGHTS AND SHADOWS

The International Bureau Against Alcoholism, with headquarters in Lucerne, Switzerland, seeks to co-ordinate and strengthen the temperance organizations of all countries in the Western world. It sponsored, last July, an international conference on alcoholism at Lucerne, attended by some three hundred delegates from Canada, the United States, Australia, India, and South Africa, as well as from a dozen European nations.

In his end-of-the-year report, R. Hercod, director of the Bureau, gives his estimate of the temperance cause in Europe:

"The difficulties we encountered in assembling 300 members at Lucerne whereas at former Congresses we had 600 or more testified to the ruins caused by the war, in some European countries quite especially. Many of the temperance societies can hardly carry on their work at all: the expense even of printing a volume, a bro-

chure, upsets their budget so that their perseverance is really heroic.

"The liquor trade, on the other hand, had no such obstacles to surmount. In certain countries, Switzerland for instance, one is surprised, even dismayed, to remark the growing publicity in favor of alcoholic beverages, quite especially in the form of posters advertising certain liquors. This publicity seems to pay, judging by the number of customers who patronized all the places where liquor was sold.

"A striking feature of our contemporary alcoholism is that it extends also to women who formerly drank little or no alcohol. In most countries a woman who drank to excess was a rare spectacle. This is no longer the case. It is true that on the Continent at least women do not usually frequent the ordinary public houses; but there are tearooms where, at certain hours, tea is the drink least in favor, for they provide all sorts of alcoholic beverages, so-called "ladies' liqueurs" in which the sweet taste conceals the strong alcohol content, as well as port and other dessert wines. These compete more and more victoriously with tea, not to mention fruit juices.

"Men also are victims of the aperitive habit. Manual workers and intellectuals alike are accustomed to finish their day's work with an aperitive, which, a witty Frenchman has said, opens the appetite with a false key. They enjoy sipping these liqueurs before the midday or evening meal. Even at charity or religious fetes the aperitive makes its appearance. Diplomats absorb their favorite liqueurs while discussing weighty affairs and believe they are serving the cause of world peace.

"These new customs, the cocktail habit and the domestic bar which demoralizes the family, constitute a very grave danger.

"We had believed formerly that the automobile would be our best ally in the fight against alcoholism, for drinking at the wheel is a recognized danger. It threatens not only the driver himself and his companions but also other users of the road, sober drivers, victims of a collision, cyclists, and pedestrians.

"With the constant increase of road traffic the drinking driver constitutes a real social danger which must be combated with the utmost energy. The International Temperance Union is conscious of this and is preparing for 1950 an international conference on alcohol and traffic to which will be invited all the Governments and others interested, and which will submit to the Governments and road user a veritable traffic code, in so far as alcohol is concerned."

CITIZENSHIP

The 81st Congress got under way with a speed seldom observed in the Capitol city. The organization of the new Congress was quickly accomplished. From the first week bills went into the legislative mill in steady streams. Among the first was the national health bill, numbered S.5, in line with the President's message that especially emphasized compulsory health insurance and Federal Aid to Education. Federal Aid to Education didn't go on the list until a day or two later, and bears the number S.246. The health bill had only one sponsor; and perhaps the education bill was delayed because it has 9 Democrats and 5 Republicans as sponsors.

The work that you did with your Congressman and Senator before they came to Washington to help them to understand the meaning of Christian policy as practiced in the legislative field is very important now. As soon as this session got under way, it faced momentous decisions. The long-range implications of such questions as the Church and State angle of Federal Aid to Education, the interna-

tional, economic tensions involved in the extension of reciprocal trade agreements, the kind of labor legislation to replace the Taft-Hartley act, cannot be overemphasized. It is sobering to sit in committee hearings and watch the effect of the strongly organized pressure groups who think in terms of self-interest. One wonders again and again how much spiritual help is being given from home to the men who have to make decisions that mold our destiny. An elder in a Presbyterian Church was elected to high public office. His minister spent the first two weeks with him (except for Sundays) after he took office, sat in on some of his early conferences, and each day the two men had prayer together. They are still closely allied, and it is not by accident that this official is making a distinguished record of outstanding service for all the people whom he represents.

Collective Defense Pacts

By the time this issue reaches you the details of the North Atlantic Pact probably will be announced by the State Department. (*Be sure to read articles by Vera Micheles Dean and Blair Bolles in this issue of* SOCIAL PROGRESS.) A State Department release to our office indicates that through this pact the United States must give active support both moral and material in the struggle to secure military strength for security purposes. We quote: "It [the United States] must determine what can be done to help those nations build a military establishment strong enough to assure their effective self-defense. It must at the same time continue to assist them toward economic recovery. On the other hand, the United States must be careful in doing so, not to weaken its own basic economic strength."

This is the first pact under consideration since the passage of the Vandenberg Resolution (June 11, 1948) that seems to involve the country so directly in a complete military pact. The Rio Treaty (Dec. 3, 1948) provided for collective action by American republics in the event of an armed attack against a Western Hemisphere nation.

We call to your attention the action of General Assembly against militarism on June 1, 1948. "We believe the most ominous present threat to freedom and the peace of the world lies in the militarization of the nations. The United States, as the leading world power, should take bold steps to reverse such a trend. To date, our national tendency has been to fall in with and to accentuate rather than to retard this trend."

Displaced Persons Legislation

Of the numerous bills introduced to amend Public Law 774 (the Displaced Persons Act of 1948), S. 311, sponsored by J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, and Matthew Neely, of West Virginia, appears to be scheduled for action in the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the floor.

This amending bill has the following provisions:

It will:

1. Increase the total number to be admitted from 205,000 to 400,000.

2. Change the cut off date so that persons who entered camps up until April 21, 1947, are eligible. (Present law fixes date at December 22, 1945.)

3. Liberalize the provisions regarding guarantees of housing and "job in the United States" and require, instead, assurances that refugees "will not become a public charge."

4. Eliminate the requirement that half the number coming in should be charged against future immigration quotas.

5. Provide for nondiscrimination against groups, and eliminate the 40 per cent assigned to the Baltic countries.

6. Repeal the provision that 30 per cent of the immigrants should be agricultural workers and establish a broader basis for eligibility.

The bill does not:

1. Include refugees other than those from Allied Europe, such as Shanghai, Palestine, and the civil war refugees in India and China.

2. Do anything more for millions of expellees or persons of German ancestry who were forced out of eastern Europe into Germany and who are not cared for by the International Refugee Organization. The McGrath bill does not change the provision in the present bill to admit 27,000 people of German ethnic origin.

Those opposed to their admission argue that most of these Germans are Nazis or Nazi sympathizers and should not receive consideration; also that the main problem is to resettle persons now interned in D.P. camps. Those who favor admitting some ethnic Germans believe that they are victims of war too, that many of them are not sympathizers with totalitarianism and could be screened as are the other displaced persons. Further, it would seem that the United States bears some responsibility for their forcible removal from their homes, not only because of the wartime agreements, but because of the dictates of mercy and humanitarianism as well.

The fact remains that the over-all problem of refugees and of immigration still has not been met by the proposed bill. The International Refugee Organization, through which the cases of people in displaced persons camps are handled, is only planned to run until sometime in 1950. Every political disturbance leaves a wake of homeless, stateless people.

Although there are other immigration bills that may be considered, at present there are no plans, either in the UN or in Congress, adequately to meet the expanding problem of homeless people.

Federal Aid to Education

Senator Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, heads the list of sponsors for the Federal Aid to Education measure, S. 246. This bill is identical with the Taft bill passed by the Senate last year, but never acted on by the House. Other sponsors include Senators Hill of Alabama, Murray of Montana, Neely of West Virginia, Chavez of New Mexico, Pepper of Florida, Ellender of Louisiana, McGrath of Rhode Island, Long of Louisiana, Taft of Ohio, Tobey of New Hampshire, Aiken of Vermont, and Smith of New Jersey.

The bill seeks more nearly to equalize educational opportunity throughout the United States by distributing Federal funds to states on the basis of their needs and their efforts in relation to per capita income. The states administer the funds. Guarantees for state and local control are written into the bill. The initial appropriation would be $300,000,000 per year.

The two most debated features are aid to parochial schools and the question of segregation. The bill provides that Federal funds may be used in states for aid to parochial schools where the states themselves give grants for schoolbooks, lunches, etc. The alternative would be Federal control. There also seems to be an effort to introduce nonsegregation provisions instead of the present supposedly equal support of both white and colored schools.

Antidiscrimination

Antidiscrimination (FEPC) Bill, S. 174. This and other civil rights measures, such as the anti-poll tax and antilynching bills, are not expected to be considered for some time. Letters to Senators and Representatives urging early consideration may help. An antifilibuster measure is, of course, of basic importance.

• The following bills are now under consideration in committees. They are not

necessarily the bills that will eventually come to the floor of the Senate and House.

Wages (Fair Labor Standards), S. 248. Raises minimum wage to 75 cents per hour. Sponsored by Thomas, Pepper, Chavez, Green, Magnuson, McGrath, Murray, Myers, Taylor, Wagner. Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Displaced Persons, S. 311; H. R. 1344. Amends Displaced Persons Act, sponsored by McGrath, Neely. Senate or House Judiciary Committee.

Housing, S. 138; H. R. 933. Establishes national housing policy. Sponsored by Ellender, Wagner, Maybank, Sparkman, Myers, Hill, Pepper, Long. Banking and Currency Committee.

Federal Aid to Education, S. 246. Provides for Federal aid to education. Sponsored by Thomas, Hill, Murray, Neely, Chavez, Pepper, Ellender, McGrath, Long, Taft, Tobey, Aiken, Smith (New Jersey), Ives. Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Health, S. 5. Provides national health insurance program. Sponsored by Murray, Wagner, Pepper, Chavez, Taylor, McGrath. Labor and Public Welfare Committee. (H. R. 783, Dingell; H. R. 785, Dolliver. Identical House bills.)

Immigration, H. R. 199. Permits naturalization of all immigrants having legal rights to permanent residence. Judd. Judiciary Committee.

Antidiscrimination, S. 174. Prohibits race discrimination in employment sponsored by Ives, Chavez, Downey, Morse, Murray, Myers, Saltonstall, Smith. Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Racial Discrimination and Housing, H. R. 1641. Provides that Federal funds shall not be used to provide housing where there is race discrimination. Dolliver. Banking and Currency Committee.

Reciprocal Trade, H. R. 1211 (Senate takes House bill). Extends authority of President under section 350 of Tariff Act. Sponsored by Doughton. House Ways and Means Committee.

Repeal of Taft-Hartley Act, S. 249. Also re-enacts NLRA provisions with certain exceptions and additions. Sponsored by Thomas. Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

—*Fern M. Colborn.*

"Sing-out-Sorri"

"*Sing-out-Sorri*" is a pidgin English term used by South Sea Islanders as a call for aid. It is being used now to raise shillings and pence for the United Nations Appeal for Children. These people, in the Solomons, the Bismarck Archipelago, New Guinea, and Papua, recalling what war did to their villages, are sending out their "*Sing-out-Sorri*" for the children in other countries who "have no food or medicine." "It will be a good thing to do," the appeal concludes.

Word of this unusual response came from Rabaul, New Britain, by way of the Australian Government, which administers the affairs of many of the islands under the United Nations.

Did you know that Major General Claire Chennault of the famed Flying Tigers in the last war has been writing his memoirs? Among other things he says: "As a practicing warrior of many years, I am convinced that war is completely futile. It settles only the problems of the past and creates new problems for the future. There is no place in the world today for the narrow, competitive nationalism that sparks the tinder of war. My experience as an airman has taught me the puniness of the elaborate, artificially erected, man-made borders of political states. . . . I am convinced that the people of this planet must move inevitably toward a single form of world government if civilization is to survive."

Chairmen of Committees of the Senate

Agriculture and Forestry	Elmer Thomas, Oklahoma
Appropriations	Kenneth McKellar, Tennessee
Armed Services	Millard E. Tydings, Maryland
Banking and Currency	Burnet R. Maybank, South Carolina
District of Columbia	J. Howard McGrath, Rhode Island
Expenditures in the Executive Department	John L. McClellan, Arkansas
Finance	Walter F. George, Georgia
Foreign Relations	Tom Connally, Texas
Interior and Insular Affairs	Joseph C. O'Mahoney, Wyoming
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Edwin C. Johnson, Colorado
Judiciary	Pat McCarran, Nevada
Labor and Public Welfare	Elbert D. Thomas, Utah
Post Office and Civil Service	Olin D. Johnston, South Carolina
Public Works	Dennis Chavez, New Mexico
Rules and Administration	Carl Hayden, Arizona

Chairmen of Committees of the House of Representatives

Agriculture	Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina
Appropriations	Clarence Cannon, Missouri
Armed Services	Carl Vinson, Georgia
Banking and Currency	Brent Spence, Kentucky
District of Columbia	John L. McMillan, South Carolina
Education and Labor	John Lesinski, Michigan
Expenditures in the Executive Departments	William L. Dawson, Illinois
Foreign Affairs	Sol Bloom, New York
House Administration	Mary T. Norton, New Jersey
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	Robert Crosser, Ohio
Judiciary	Emanuel Celler, New York
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	Schuyler Otis Bland, Virginia
Post Office and Civil Service	Tom Murray, Tennessee
Public Lands	Andrew L. Somers, New York
Public Works	William M. Whittington, Mississippi
Rules	Adolph J. Sabath, Illinois
Un-American Activities	John S. Wood, Georgia
Ways and Means	Robert L. Doughton, North Carolina
Veterans' Affairs	John E. Rankin, Mississippi

Form of address for correspondence to United States Senators:
The Honorable ————, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Form of address for correspondence to United States Representatives:
Honorable ————, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Extracts from the President's Budget

			(all figures in millions)
Total			$41,858
Items requested since the budget was submitted, and now outside the budget, bring the total to			45,000
Military establishment (in budget)		$14,218	
Additional requests (outside budget):			
Military stockpiling	$525		
New military construction	430		
Atomic Energy Commission	740		
Selective Service System	16.7		
Universal Military Training	800		
Grand total for military expenditures (This does not include over 1 billion for military government and relief in occupied areas, nor military assistance contemplated for Greece, Turkey, or western Europe)		16,729.7	
International Organizations, total		97.7	
United Nations	18.1		
UNESCO	3.7		
World Health Organization	1.9		
International Labor Organization	.8		
Food and Agriculture Organization	1.2		
Pan American Union	1.5		
International Refugee Organization	70.5		
International Children's Fund	Nothing		
Education		429.4	
To continue existing programs	129.4		
Federal Aid (if passed)	300		
Health			
Total for public health service, including grants to states		177.9	
Veterans hospitals and health services		850.8	

All figures taken from the Official Budget as published by the United States Government Printing Office.

Our EASTER PLAYS AND PAGEANTS

Will increase the reverence and the inspirational value of your Easter Service in Church or School.

The Shadow of the Cross: by Aileene Sargent, New; dramatic and impressive. 5 main char., chorus and tableaux. 35c

The Dawning: Wonderful pageant of the Resurrection of Jesus by Lyman R. Bayard. 50c

The Questioner: Bayard 50c

The Holy Sepulchre: Bayard 50c

The Tidings: Bayard 50c

Into Galilee: Bayard 35c

Print of the Nails: Davis 50c

When Christ Arose: Parsons 35c

The Children's Vision: Bates 35c

Stone Against The Heart: 35c

The Quest: Easter Service: 25c

Challenge of the Cross: 50c

Send 10 cents each for loan copies of pageants you wish to examine. Return in 10 days or remit balance of price. Write for catalogue.
PAGEANT PUBLISHERS, Dept. E-5 P.O. Box 306 West Los Angeles 25, Calif.

About Books

Young Laymen—Young Church, by John Oliver Nelson. Association Press. $1.75.

Here are case histories of projects undertaken by young laymen. The author is in a position to evaluate Christian attitudes and action, since his five years as head of the Department of Life Work of our Presbyterian Board of Christian Education was preceded by a pastorate in the Presbytery of Pittsburgh and followed by his present task as Director of the Commission on the Ministry for the Federal Council of Churches.

This book begins with a brief but comprehensive survey of Christian lay movements. Against this background, specific situations are projected. There is a fair appraisal of what mass education, political action, psychiatric clinics, and scientific laboratories have done and can do. Then the author raises these questions: "Granting that these other agencies and movements have failed to make man whole, can the church in community or world really do any better? If we are not starting afresh, with formation of a new Christian fellowship, can young adults work within the encrusted old institution of Christianity—or can anybody else for that matter?"

Approximately two thirds of the book are devoted to what young adults have done in revitalized church groups, in terms of "reaffirming the importance of church, rebuilding Sunday worship, digging into philosophy and theology, thinking through Bible, missions, world church, neighborhood needs and home life, renewing the life of quiet prayer and retreat." Pastors, young adults, and "anybody else" may well be amazed at some of the author's revelations as to how "Christ still revolutionizes common life in the atomic age as young followers make the exciting discovery that in him is the one answer left to the question of human existence."

These facts are presented in a challenging way which makes stimulating reading for these days of renewed emphasis on the Geneva Fellowship as well as on lay leadership in general. The author's practical approaches to problems do much to prove that the Christian religion does make men "tick," not as isolated individuals, but as personalities well integrated by power found through the Christian Church which by its publishing of the good news may renew its youth in every generation.

—Esther T. Slosser.

Gaining the Faith You Need, by James Gordon Gilkey. The Macmillan Company. $2.00.

These twelve sermons deal with modern religious difficulties that trouble many people. They attempt to help those who are intellectually confused about such matters as life's meaning, God's will for the individual, tragic life situations, receiving God's guidance, and how to maintain an intelligent belief in God.

In clear and direct language, Dr. Gilkey outlines practical steps in living "the religious life." Each sermon deals with a vital question or problem. He outlines what he believes is liberal Protestant faith, and the arguments that support that faith. The statement, on page 34, that "Jesus was a human being rather than God in human form . . . a successor to the Old Testament prophets" reveals the author's theological position.

The book is well written and contains many fine illustrations from Dr. Gilkey's

rich experience. Presbyterians may not accept all his arguments and conclusions, but he gives clear and logical help to sincere inquirers often confused by religious terminology.

—*Gordon W. Mattice.*

Black Odyssey, by Roi Ottley. Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.50.

The story of the Negro in America, as Roi Ottley traces that odyssey, starts with the present position of those whom the author designates as "Untouchables, American Style," the title of the first chapter. Three hundred pages of well-presented facts follow before we are reminded that all this deals with what Chapter Ten points out to be "No Private Affairs." The closing words in the book bear quoting, for they deal with an incident that is given more than local significance by Henry Beetle Hough, editor of the *Gazette,* published in Martha's Vineyard.

Two Negroes were barred from a public golf course in that place. This discrimination called forth an editorial that stated: "This is a small island, but a part of the one world in which the destinies of mankind are bound up, and some share in the making of the future is ours. The dignity of the individual, and his civil rights, must be defended always, but the real test today is the ability and desire of all of us to meet Americans as Americans."

"Otherwise," the author warns, "it may be as one old Negro woman said, 'God gonna keep a-punishin' white folks!'"

It is a punishment to have to put this book down once the reader starts to follow Mr. Ottley as a guide. Each chapter is headed by a numeral enclosed as though it were a route number marking a national highway. Intriguing chapter titles lure one on to thoughtful discovery of their real significance. The chapter entitled "Steal Away, Steal Away" is not the story of runaway slaves, as the reader might suppose, but the grim chronicle of the "new slavery" which developed as the patriarchal system of slavery was replaced by a system of economic exploitation in the sugar and cotton industries.

By his skilled handling of historical facts, Roi Ottley shows himself the reporter in whose work "the undertones as well as the overtones have been added to the record." From "The African Gentleman" who appears as the first legal slaveholder in America to the Negroes who "felt the need to present the problems of Negroes in the United States to the United Nations" stretches a period of a bit over three centuries. The author has consulted reliable sources for his facts. These are carefully noted in the foreword and in the bibliography, and painstaking research lies behind the vivid word pictures of "the Negro mass, whose frustrating search for democracy should acutely concern white America—an America reaching for moral leadership of the world."

—*Esther T. Slosser.*

The Importance of Being Ourselves, by Dr. Arnold Hilmar Lowe. Harper & Brothers, publishers. $2.00.

To read or to hear a sermon by Dr. Lowe is to experience preaching at its best. Each month a grateful church prints one of his sermons, and for some time your reviewer has been receiving them. Not a dull one in the lot!

Each of the twenty-two sermons deals with the great facts and assurances of the Christian faith. The simplicity and logical development, the skillful application of ancient truth to modern conditions, the beauty of language, coupled with straight-from-the-shoulder convictions, make these sermons outstanding.

The crucial importance of the part of the parent in the education of children in the home, and the sanctity of the home, are frequently stressed. Social problems are dealt with not only to diagnose, but to apply a remedy. These sermons are bracing messages for our day.

—*Gordon W. Mattice.*

RACE RELATIONS WORKSHOP

The Institute on Racial and Cultural Relations of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America will conduct a Leadership Training Workshop in Oakland, California, March 14-18. Ministers and lay leaders, meeting for a period of intensive study and group discussions, will explore methods of effecting Christian democratic solutions of the many problems of minority groups on the West Coast.

The enrollment of the workshop will be interracial, including Orientals, Mexicans, Negroes, and whites, and will be limited to 30 or 35 participants who have had special experience in and concern about racial and cultural relations. They should be leaders who will return to their local churches and communities with a constructive program as a result of this specialized leadership training.

The sponsoring agency of the Institute was created just a year ago by mandate of the General Assembly "to work for a nonsegregated church in a nonsegregated society."

—*Wm. H. McConaghy.*

Lenten Sacrifice

The coming of the Lenten season on March 2 should prompt Presbyterians throughout America to participate in our Church's sacrificial offerings for overseas relief. Every Presbyterian family is urged to plan a sacrificial meal each Friday in Lent, and to contribute the difference between the cost of the austerity meal and the average American dinner to the Overseas Relief Fund. Consult your minister about the plans your church is making. Remember also to listen with family and friends on Saturday evening, March 26, to the nation-wide interdenominational radio appeal for overseas aid, "One Great Hour."

Keep up with

THE 81ST CONGRESS!

Subscribe today to

SOCIAL PROGRESS

One year's subscription - $1.00

Attractive group rate for churches

A CALL TO PRAYER

You are invited to join with all peoples in
a fellowship of prayer on the
World Day of Prayer
Friday, March 4, 1949

In a thousand differing tongues our prayers will rise and from a thousand differing temples, but the Lord of Life hears all. His Spirit hovers above those who pray under the shade of his trees; he warms the hearts of those who worship in cold, barren rooms; he moves up and down the aisles of high cathedrals; and the Presence will be real in thatch-roofed chapels and bring a glow to mud-walled huts. God will precede his worshipers into hospitals and factories and radio stations.

Some will pray for bread and some for clothing. All will pray for peace and a deeper communion with God.

Come, let us worship and bow down.

Daily Prayer of High Resolve

Infinite God, yet tender Father of us all, we bow before thee in adoration. In differing speech we utter our praise, confess our sins, declare our vows of consecration. Thou understandest all.

Forgive our generation the sin of walled-up thinking, and give us grace to expand our caring from narrow domestic and national walls to the vast human family, until children now paralyzed by fear may feel the loving touch of mothers far away.

In hatred of war and its killing we are united. Hold us to a new high unity, our Father, and in that unity give us grace to change our behavior that wars may cease and thy Kingdom come. Grant us strength to melt our pride into humility, to change our race and class prejudice into fellowship, to turn our selfishness into sharing. Rewrite into our hearts the sure knowledge that thine is the Kingdom and thine the power.

In this chill hour of the world's winter of indecision, grant to all mankind the shining courage to follow the difficult road of the Man of Galilee, the Christ of Calvary—our Lord. Amen.

—The United Council of Church Women, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

A giant TVA is proposed for the Jordan River Valley. The desert will "blossom as the rose" when man harnesses the sweet flowing waters of this Holy Land river, diverting them into productivity before they are forever lost to the Dead Sea.

When the church with the community causes justice to "roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream," then shall we know a society fit for the children of men where "they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig-tree; and none shall make them afraid." It all depends on whether the free-flowing grace of the master Engineer of the universe is harnessed by a Church dedicated to the elimination of greed, poverty, war, prejudice. Christian social engineering will bring us to the promised land of abundant living.

The character of the American community depends on the moral and spiritual climate created by the Christian Church within that community. Vast tracts of human society are still barren wastelands because of scorching sun of a sensate culture.